SOME NEW BOOKS.

Ancient Egypt: The Last Page in Her History.

We have reviewed, as they appeared, the first two volumes of Prof. MASPERO'S monumental work on the history of the ancient East, including not only the empire of the Pharaohs but that which successively found its centre in Chaldea, Assyria and Persia. The third and concluding volume carries us from 850 to 330 B. C., for, with the overthrow of the Persian Empire by the Greek soldiers of Alexander, a new era began. Thenceforth the culture which had grown up on the banks of the Euphrates and the Nile passed to the West, there assumed new features and was inspired with a new spirit. Greece becomes mistress of the Orient, and behind Greece looms the colossal figure of the Roman Republic. Prof. A. H. Sayce points out in a preface that, since the first volume of Maspero's work was published, excavation has gone on apace in both Egypt and Babylonia, and discoveries of a startling nature have been made. It follows that many pages of that volume will have to be rewritten. In Babylonia, for instance, the excavations at Niffer and Tello have shown that Sargon of Akkad, far from being a creature of romance, was as much an historical monarch as Nebuchadnezzar himself. Contracts have been found dated in the years when Sargon was occupied in conquering Syria and Palestine, and a cadastral survey, or Domesday book, that was made for the purposes of taxation, mentions a Canaanite who had been appointed "Governor of the land of the Amorites." Even a postal service had been already established along the high roads which knitted the several parts of Sargon's empire together. Confirmatory discoveries have been made at Susa and in Armenia. From Egypt have come even more revolutionary revelations. At Abydos and Kom el-Ahmar, opposite El Kab, monuments have been disinterred of the kings of the First and Second Dynasties, if not of even earlier princes, while at Negaga, north of Thebes, the late director of the Service of Egyptian Antiquities, M. de Morgan, has found a tomb which seems to have been that of Menes himself. A new world of art has been thus opened; we find ourselves thrust backward to a date when even the hieroglyphic system of writing was, as yet, immature and strange. Art, however, was already well advanced; hard stone was cut into vases and bowls, and even into statuary of considerable artistic excellence; glazed porcelain was already made, and bronze, or rather copper, was fashioned into weapons and tools. The writing material, as in Babylonia, was often clay, over which sealed cylinders of a Babylonian pattern were rolled. Equally Babylonian are the strange and composite animals engraved on some of the objects of this early age, as well as the structure of the tombs, which were built not of stone, but of crude brick, and which had their external walls panelled and pilastered.

Prof. Hommel's theory, which brings from Babylonia Egyptian civilization along with the ancestors of the historical Egyptians, has thus been largely verified. The historical civilized Egyptians, however, were not the first inhabitants of the Valley of the Nile. Not only have palæolithic instruments been found on the plateaus of the desert; the relics of neolithic man have turned up in extraordinary abundance. When the Egyptians of the First and Second Dynasties, or, perhaps, of a somewhat earlier date, arrived with their copper weapons and their system of writing, the Nile Valley was already occupied by a pastoral people who had attained a high level of neolithic culture. Their flint implements are the most beautiful and delicately finished that have ever been discovered; they were able to carve vases of great artistic excellence out of the hardest of stone, and their pottery was of no mean quality. Long after the country had come into the possession of the historical dynasty, and even after it had been united under a single monarchy, the aboriginal settlements continued to exist on the outskirts of the desert, and the neolithic culture that distinguished them passed only gradually away. By degrees, however, the aborigines intermingled with their conquerors from Asia, and thus formed the Egyptian race of a later day. Already, however, they had made Egypt what it has been throughout the historical period. Under the direction of the Asiatic immigrants, and by means of the engineering science, the first home of which had been the alluvial plain of Babylonia, they accomplished the great works of irrigation which confined the Nile to its present channel, which cleared away the jungle and the swamp that had formerly bordered the desert, and turned them into fertile fields. Theirs were the hands which carried out the plans of their more intelligent masters, and cultivated the valley when once it had been reclaimed. The Egypt of history was the creation of a two-fold race: the Egyptians of the monuments supplied the controlling and directing power; the Egyptians of the neolithic graves bestowed upon it their labor and their skill.

For Maspero's third volume, entitled *The Passing of the Empires*, (Appletons), there is an abundance of materials, such as do not exist for the earlier portions of his history. Here the evidence of the monuments is supplemented by that of Hebrew and classical writers. Not the less are the conclusions open to dispute. For our knowledge of the decline and fall of the Assyrian Empire, for example, we have still to depend chiefly on the untrustworthy legends of the Greeks. Even where native monuments come to the historian's aid, they have not seldom introduced difficulties and doubts where none seemed to exist before. Cyrus and his forefathers, for instance, turn out to have been kings of Anzan, and not of Persia, thus explaining why it is that the Neo-Susian language appears by the side of the Persian and the Babylonian as one of the three official tongues of the Persian Empire; but we still have to learn what was the relation of Anzan to Persia on the one hand and to Susa on the other, and when it was that Cyrus of Anzan became also King of Persia. Similar questions arise as to the position and nationality of Astyages. He is called in the inscriptions not a Mede but a Manda, a name which, as Prof. Sayce has shown, meant for the Babylonian a "barbarian" of Kurdistan. Prof. Sayce himself has little doubt that the Manda over whom Astyages ruled were the Scythians of classical tradition. Upon these and like problems, it is possible that De Morgan's excavations at Susa may throw some light, but Prof. Sayce chiefly looks for help to the work of the German expedition, which has just begun the systematic exploration of the site of Babylon. The Babylon of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar rose on the political ruins, though not, of course, upon the site of Nineveh, and the story of the downfall of the Assyrian Empire must still be lying beneath the Babylonian mounds.

I.

We shall leave for another occasion the chapters of the book before us which deal with the history of the Euphrates Valley, from the date of the Assyrian revival under Assurnazirpal down to the conquest of the Persian Empire by Alexander, and confine ourselves to the history of Egypt during that period. For a long time after the expedition of Sheshonk into Asia (about 948 B. C.), the Egyptian monarchy seems to have lost all interest in foreign politics. Osorkon I. had not inherited the warlike propensities of his father, and Osorkon's son and grandson had followed his example. These monarchs, indeed, regarded themselves as traditionary suzerains of the country of Kharu, that is to say of Judah, Israel, Ammon and Moab, but they seldom stirred from their own territory, and contented themselves with protecting their frontiers against the depredations of nomad tribes. Under their rule, Egypt enjoyed an extended period of profound peace, which was spent in works of public utility, especially in the Delta, where, thanks to the descendants of Sheshonk, Bubastis came to be one of the most splendid among the cities of secondary importance. Its temple, which had been rebuilt by Rameses II., and decorated by his descendants, was in a sorry plight when the Twenty-second Dynasty came into power. Osorkon I., whom we have just mentioned, entirely remodelled it, and Osorkon II. added several new halls. Another temple of small size which had been built in the time of Rameses II. was enlarged by Osorkon I., and richly endowed with workshops, lands, cattle, slaves and precious metals; a single one of the deities worshipped there received offerings of gold valued by weight at £120,000 and silver ingots worth £12,000. It is obvious that a country which could afford to indulge in such extravagances must have been in a flourishing condition, and everything goes to prove that Egypt prospered under the rule of the early Bubastite kings. The same causes, however, which had ruined the Ramessides eventually compassed the downfall of the Bubastite Dynasty. The military feudalism from which it had sprung was suppressed for a time by Sheshonk I., but developed almost unchecked under his successors. They tried, it is true, to break it up and turn it to their own advantage by transferring the more important religious functions and the principal fiefs to their own sons or nephews. Thebes, however, managed to exclude such representatives of the ruling dynasty, and lost no opportunity of proving itself the most turbulent of the baronies.

For a long time Thebes had suffered no diminution of territory, and half of upper Egypt, from Elephantine to Siut, acknowledged its sway. Through all the changes of dynasty, its political constitution had remained unaltered. Amon still ruled there supreme as ever, and nothing was done until he had been formally consulted in accordance with ancient usage. Events were to prove that but little reliance could be placed on the loyalty of the Thebans, and that energetic measures were needed to keep them in the path of duty. Toward the close of the Twenty second or Bubastite Dynasty, the royal domain became narrowed down to the Memphite Nome and the private appanages of the reigning house, and, finally, it no longer yielded the sums necessary for the due performance of costly religious ceremonies, such as the enthronement or burial of an Apis, or sacred bull. When the last king of this family passed away after an inglorious reign of some thirty-seven years, the prestige of his line had so completely declined that the country would have no more of it, and the sceptre passed into the hands of another dynasty, this time of Tanite origin. It was, apparently, a younger branch of the Bubastite House, allied to the Ramessides. The first of the line secured recognition in Thebes, and throughout the rest of Egypt as well, but his influence was little greater than had been that of his predecessor. As in the past, the real power was in the hands of the High Priest. Under his successors, the hold over Thebes was lost, and even the Seven Nomes and the Delta were split up to such an extent that, at one time, they included something like a score of independent principalities.

About 740 B. C., there appeared in the midst of these turbulent and extortionate nobles, a man who, by sheer force of energy and talent, easily outstripped all competitors. Tafnakhti was a chief of obscure origin, whose hereditary rights were extremely limited, but one or two victories gained over his nearest neighbors encouraged him to widen the sphere of his operations. He first of all took possession of those Nomes of the Delta which extended to the west of the principal arm of the Nile; then, leaving untouched the eastern provinces, over which the representative of the Twenty-third Dynasty exercised an easy-going rule, Tafnakhti made his way up the river. Eventually, the petty kings and princes of the Said and the Delta who still remained unconquered called for help upon Ethiopia, the only power capable of holding its ground against the usurper. The so-called Kush probably became an independent State about the time when the Bubastite kings came into power, say 970 B. C. Peopled by Theban settlers, and governed by the civil and religious code of Thebes, the provinces which lay between the Cataract of Hannek and the confluence of the two Niles, soon became a second Thebaid, more barren and less opulent than the first, but no less tied to the traditions of the past. Napata, its capital, lay in a plain at the foot of a sandstone cliff which rose perpendicularly to the height of nearly two hundred feet. This was the sacred Mount, in the heart of which the god was supposed to have his dwelling; the ruins of several temples can still be seen near the western extremity of the hill, the finest of them being dedicated to a local Amon-Ra. This Amon was a replica of the Theban Amon on a smaller scale, and was associated with the same companions, to wit, a consort and a son. He owed his origin to the same religious concepts, and his priests lived in accordance with the rules of the Theban hierarchy. The Kings of Ethiopia—not, of course, to be confounded geographically with the modern Abyssinia, because its southern limit was the point now occupied by Khartoum—were priests from the first, and never lost their sacerdotal character. On the death of a sovereign Amon at once became Regent in the person of his Prophet, and continued to act until the funeral rites were celebrated; after which, all the males of the royal family were paraded before the statue of the god, and he on whom the god laid his hand as he passed was considered the chosen one of Amon, and consecrated king without delay. The bulk of the population of the region between the First Cataract and the mouth of the Blue Nile consisted at the epoch under review of settlers of Egyptian extraction and Egyptianized natives; but, isolated as they were from Egypt proper by the rupture of the political ties which had bound them to the metropolis, they ceased to receive fresh re-enforcements from the northern part of the valley, and daily became more closely identified with the races of various origin which roamed through the deserts of Libya or Arabia.

The constant infiltration of Bedouin blood and the large number of black women found in the harems of the rich and even in the huts of the common people, quickly impaired the purity of the race, even among the upper classes, and the type came to resemble that of the negro tribes of equatorial Africa. The language fared no better, and the written characters soon became as corrupt as the oral tongue. The taste for art had decayed, technical ability began to deteriorate, the moral and intellectual standard declined and the mass of the people showed signs of relapsing into barbarism. Only the leaders of the aristocracy and the scribes preserved in decadent Ethiopa to a considerable extent their inheritance from an older civilization. Egypt still attracted them; they looked upon it as their rightful possession, torn from them by alien usurpers in defiance of all sense of right, and they never ceased to hope that, some day, when the gods saw fit, they would win back their heritage. Thebes, for its part, admitted the validity of their claim: it looked to them for help, and the revolts by which it had been torn for some two hundred years were, perhaps, instigated by the partisans of Ethiopia. After the accession of the Twenty third Dynasty in Memphis, Thebes placed itself under the immediate orders of Ethiopia and the Theban pontificate disappeared, the recognition of a sovereign invested by hereditary right with the functions and title of High Priest of Amon rendering the existence of such an office locally superfluous. The administration of religious, and, perhaps, also of political affairs at Thebes, was, consequently, handed over to a deputy prophet. It was to the Ethiopian suzerain of Thebes that many princes of the Delta and Middle Egypt appealed for aid against the usurper Tafnakhti, and their appeal was not fruitless, though the ensuing struggle was a protracted and bitter one. The outcome of it was that the empire of the Pharaohs, which had been long divided, was re-established from the confluence of the Blue and the White Niles to the shores of the Mediterranean, but it was no longer Egypt that benefitted by the change. It was now the turn of Ethiopia to rule, and the seat of power was transferred from Thebes or Memphis to Napata. As a matter of fact, the fundamental constitution of the kingdom underwent no great modification: it had merely one king the more to rule over it, not a stranger, as we are tempted to conclude when we would measure these old-world revolutions by our modern standards of patriotism, but a native of the south, who took the place of those natives of the north who had long succeeded one another on the throne. As a matter of fact, the newly-crowned son of Ra lived very far away; he had no troops of his own further north than Siut, and he had imposed his suzerainty on the rival claimants and reigning princes without thereby introducing any change in the constitution of the State. In tendering their submission to him, the heads of the different Nomes had not the slightest intention of parting with their liberty; they still retained it, even though nominally dependent, and continued, as in the past, to abuse it, without scruple. Indeed, the prestige investing the Tanite race, persisted so effectively that the annalists give to the representatives of the last-named family precedence over the usurpers of the Ethiopian Dynasty.

An Ethiopian king was lord of Egypt in 670 B. C., when the Nile Valley was invaded by Esarhaddon, King of Nineveh. After several battles, in each of which the Assyrian tactics triumphed, Memphis succumbed, and was mercilessly sacked. The Ethiopian sovereign, with his army decimated and exhausted, beat a hasty retreat southward, but he still appeared so formidable, that Esarhaddon abstained from pursuing him up the Nile Valley. Assyrian governors were placed over the petty kingdoms and fiefs into which Lower Egypt and the Delta were divided, and a heavy annual tribute was imposed. Esarhaddon thenceforth styled himself King of the Kings of Egypt, of the Said and of Kush, so great was his pride at having trampled under foot the land of the Delta. As a matter of fact, the Ethiopian sovereign was safe beyond his reach. Subsequently, Lower Egypt revolted, but was reconquered about 667 B. C. by Assurbanipal, and this time the whole of the Nile Valley, from the Mediterranean to the First Cataract, became Assyrian territory.

II.

Let us pass to the circumnavigation of Africa by an Egyptian fleet in the reign of Necho II., and to the foundation of Greek settlements in the Delta. Necho II. came to the throne of his father, Psammetichus, in 611 B. C., and long had to contend against the danger of subjection to the new Babylonian Empire which had arisen on the ruins of the Assyrian. In order to cope with Nebuchadnezzar, Necho II. not only organized Egyptian and Libyan troops, but enrolled a still larger number of Hellenic mercenaries. He also endeavored to strengthen his Eastern frontier by the co-operation of a fleet. He thought that, if he could succeed in securing the command of the sea, his galleys, by continually cruising along the Syrian coast, would so foster a spirit of rebellion there that the Chaldeans would not dare to venture as far as Egypt. Necho II. accordingly set himself to increase the number of his war vessels, not only on the Mediterranean, but also on the Red Sea, and, as he had drawn upon Greece for his troops, he applied to her, as well as to Phoenicia, for shipbuilders. Herodotus says that, in his time, the ruins of the docks which Necho II. had made for the building of his triremes could still be seen on the shore of the Red Sea, as well as on that of the Mediterranean. Thucydides tells us that the trireme, which had been invented by either the Samian or the Corinthian naval constructors, had been, as yet, but little used; nevertheless, Necho II. acquired a considerable number of such vessels as well as others of various build in which the blunt stem and curved poop of the Greeks were combined with the square-cabined barque of the Egyptians. At the same time, in order to transport his vessels from one sea to another, when occasion should demand, he is said, according to one tradition, to have reopened the ancient canal of Seti I., which had been silted up ever since the last years of the Twentieth Dynasty. He improved its course, we are told, and widened it so as to permit two triremes to sail abreast, or easily to clear each other in passing.

The canal of Seti I. had started from the Pelusiac branch of the Nile not far from Patumos, and skirted the foot of the Arabian hills from west to east; it then plunged into the Wady Tubilat, and finally entered the head of the bay which now forms the Lake of Ismailia. The narrow channel by which this sheet of water was anciently connected with the Gulf of Suez had become probably obstructed in places, and required clearing out at several points, if not along its entire extent. Another of Necho's enterprises excited the admiration of his contemporaries, and remained forever in the memory of the people. The Carthaginians were known to have discovered, somewhere on the ocean coast of Libya, a country rich in gold, ivory, precious woods, pepper and spices, but their political jealousy prevented other nations from following in their wake. The Egyptians may have undertaken to dispute their monopoly, or the Phœnicians may have desired to reach their South African colony by a less frequented highway than the Mediterranean. The merchants of the Said and the Delta had never entirely lost touch with the people dwelling on the shores of the Red Sea, and, though the royal fleets no longer pursued their course down it on their way to Punt, as in the days of Hatshopsitu and Rameses III., private individuals ventured, from time to time, to open trade communications with the ancient "ladders of incense." It was Necho II. who despatched the Phœnician captains of his fleets in search of new lands to the south or southwest, and they started from the neighborhood of Suez, doubtless accompanied by native pilots accustomed to navigate in the Red Seas and Indian Ocean. The voyage, fraught with difficulty even in the last century, was, indeed, a formidable one for the small vessels of the Saite period (say, 600 B. C.). The Phœnician navigators sailed south for months with the east to the left of them and on their right the continent which seemed to extend indefinitely before them. Toward the autumn they disembarked on some convenient shore, sowed the wheat with which they were provided, and waited until the crop was ready; having reaped the harvest, they again took to the sea. Any accurate remembrance of what they saw was soon effaced; they could merely recollect that, having reached a certain point, they observed with astonishment that the sun appeared to have reversed its course, and now rose on their right hand. This evidently meant that they had turned the southern extremity of Africa, and were unconsciously sailing northward. In the third year they passed through the Pillars of Hercules, and reached Egypt in safety. The very limited knowledge of navigation possessed by the mariners of that day rendered this voyage fruitless. The dangerous route thus opened up to commerce remained unused, and its discovery was remembered only as a curious feat devoid of any practical use.

The first reference to the presence of Greeks in Egypt occurs in connection with the reign of Psammetichus of Sais, son of Necho I., who flourished in the latter half of the seventh century B. C., although there is reason to believe that, at earlier dates, and probably before the Hellenic colonization of the west coast of Asia Minor, the inhabitants of the Greek islands had commercial relations with the Nile Valley, if they did not actually make settlements there. It was Psammetichus, however, who first employed Greeks continuously to supplement the native troops demoralized by poverty and the undisciplined bands of Libyan mercenaries who had constituted the sole normal force of the Tanite and Bubastite Pharaohs. From the moment that chance brought him in contact with the Ionians and Carians he surrounded himself with a regular army of Hellenic and Asiatic myrmidons. The revolution wrought by the heavy-armed hoplites from beyond the sea in the minds of the African peoples is compared with the charge of the Spanish troopers among the lightly clad foot soldiers of Mexico and Peru. With their bulging corselets, the two plates of which protected back and chest, their greaves made of a single piece of bronze, reaching from the ankle to the knee, their square or oval bucklers covered with metal and their heavy, rounded helmets fitting closely to the head and neck, they were, in truth, men of brass, invulnerable to any native Egyptian weapon. The half naked archers and pikemen of Egypt felt themselves incapable of coping with the newcomers, except by superior numbers, or by strategy. The liberality with which Psammetichus treated his foreign mercenaries would have kept them faithful even if military honor had not sufficed to make them loyal to their employer. He granted to them and their compatriots, who were attracted by the fame of Egypt, a concession of the fertile lands of the Delta, stretching along the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, where they occupied regularly intrenched camps, inclosed within massive walls, containing a collection of mud-huts or brick houses, the whole inclosure being commanded by a fortress. Some merchants from Miletus, emboldened by the example of their fellow countrymen, sailed with thirty vessels into the mouth of the Bolbitine branch of the Nile, and there founded a settlement which they named the Fort of the Milesians, not to be confounded, as Strabo confounds it, with Naucratis. Following in their wake, successive relays of immigrants arrived to re-inforce the infant colony. Psammetichus intrusted a certain number of Egyptian children to the care of these Greek settlers, to be instructed in their language, and the interpreters thus trained constituted ere long a definite class, the function of which was to act as intermediaries between the two races.

It must not be inferred, however, that the natives of the Delta were favorably disposed to the newcomers. The latter's language, their rude military customs, their cunning devices in trade, and even the astonishment they manifested at the civilization of the country, rendered them objects of disdain as well as of jealous hatred. The food of which they partook made them unclean in native estimation, and the horrified fellah shunned contact with them from fear of defiling himself, and refused to eat with them or to use the same knife or cooking vessel; the scribes and members of the higher classes, astonished at their ignorance, treated them like children with no past history, whose ancestors a few generations back had been mere savages. This, as we learn from Plato, was precisely the attitude which the Egyptian priests maintained toward inquisitive Greek travellers in the fifth century B. C. Unexpressed at first, this hostility toward the Hellenes was not long in manifesting itself openly. The Saite tradition attributed the outbreak to a movement of wounded vanity, for which Maspero believes that there is a basis of truth. To recompense the prowess of his Ionian and Carian soldiers, Psammetichus had attached them to his own person, and assigned to them the post of honor on the right wing when the army was drawn up in battle array. This distinction, coupled with certain evidences of neglect, gave great umbrage to the Libyan troops, who, under the name of Mashauasha, had formerly constituted the bulk of the Egyptian mercenaries. Believing that a rebellion would have but a small chance of success, they decided to leave the country, and 240,000 of them, assembling on a given day with their arms and baggage, marched in good order toward Ethiopia. It is significant that the inscriptions from the time of Psammetichus onward never mentioned the Mashauasha, whereas their name and exploits had continually recurred in the history of the preceding dynasty; henceforth, they and their chiefs vanish from sight, and simultaneously discord and brigandage cease in the Egyptian Nomes. The King of Napata seems to have welcomed the timely re-enforcements which arrived to fill up vacancies in his army and among his people, weakened by a century of rapid changes, and gave them permission to conquer for themselves some territory in the possession of his enemies. Having driven hence the barbarians, the military emigrants from Egypt established themselves in the peninsula formed by the White and Blue Niles and their numbers increased so greatly that, in course of time, they became a considerable nation.

III.

Amasis, who usurped the Egyptian throne in 569 B. C., having achieved his triumph in spite of the Greek mercenaries, it might have been expected that he would wish to be avenged upon them, and would have expelled them from his dominions. As a matter of fact, nothing of the kind took place, for no sooner was Amasis firmly seated upon the throne than he recalled the strangers, and eventually showed a perfect infatuation for them. In truth, he became as completely a Greek as it was possible for an Egyptian to be. He married a Greek woman of Cyrene, and made his sister's child the vassal king of that country. When the Temple of Delphi was burned down in B. C. 548, Amasis made a large contribution to the sum required for its reconstruction, and he sent magnificent presents to various Greek oracles. To Athene of Lindos he gave two stone statues and a linen corselet of marvellous fineness: to Hera of Samos he sent two wooden statues which a century later Herodotus found still intact. The Greeks now flocked to Egypt from all quarters of the Hellenic world in such considerable numbers that the laws relating to them had to be remodelled. The inhabitants of the Greek townships founded a century earlier along the Pelusiac arm of the Nile were transferred to Memphis and its environs. On the other hand, the Greek colonists of quite recent date were placed in the part of the Delta furthest removed from Asia, namely, in the triangle lying to the west of Sais, between the Canopic branch of the Nile, the mountains and the seacoast. The Miletians had established here some time previously on a canal connected with the main arm of the river the factory of Naucratis, which long remained in obscurity. The town which had grown up around this factory was turned over by Amasis to the Greeks, that they might hold it in common and make it the commercial and religious centre of their communities in Egypt. Temples already existed there, those of Apollo and Aphrodite, together with all the political and religious institutions indispensable to the constitution of an Hellenic city. Now however, the influx of immigrants thither became so large and rapid that, after the lapse of a few years, the entire internal organism and external aspect of the city were transformed. New buildings rose from the ground with incredible speed; not only the little temple of the Dioskuri, the protectors of the sailor, the temple of the Samian Hera, that of Zeus of Ægina and that of Athene, but also, ere long, the great temenos, or sacred inclosure, known as the Hellenion, which was erected at the public expense by nine Æolian, Ionian and Dorian towns of Asia Minor, to serve as a place of assembly for their countrymen, as a storehouse, as a sanctuary, and, if need be, even as a refuge and fortress, so great was its area and so thick its walls. The site of this stronghold has been discovered by Petrie; the walls were about forty-eight feet thick and thirty-nine feet high, and the rectangular area inclosed by them could easily contain 50,000 men.

It was not possible for the constitution of Naucratis to be homogeneous when many different elements entered into its composition. It seems to have been a compromise between the institutions of the Dorians and those of the Ionians. Amasis made the city a free port, accessible at all times to whoever should present themselves with peacable intent, and the privileges which he granted practically brought about the closing of all the other Egyptian seaports. The whole of the commerce of Egypt with the Greek world soon passed through the docks of Naucratis, and, in a few years, made her one of the richest emporia of the Mediterranean. The inhabitants soon overflowed the surrounding country and covered it with villas and townships. Such merchants as refused to submit to the rule of their own countrymen found a home in some other part of the Nile Valley which suited them, and even Upper Egypt and the Libyan Desert were subject to their pacific inroads. In fact, there was scarcely an Egyptian village where, in the reign of Amasis, Hellenic traders were not found selling wine, perfumes, oil and salted provisions to the natives, practising usury in all its forms, and averse to no means of enriching themselves as rapidly as possible. Those who returned to their mother country carried thither strange tales which aroused the curiosity and cupidity of their fellow citizens; and philosophers, merchants and soldiers alike set out for the land of wonders, in pursuit of knowledge, wealth or adventures. The list of illustrious Greeks who, according to tradition, visited Egypt in the sixth century, B. C., included the poet Alcaeus of Mitylene, the two Samian sculptors Theodorus and Telecles, Solon, the Athenian; Thales of Miletus and Pythagoras. It is well known that, after the death of Amasis, Egypt was subjugated by a Persian army under Cambyses, but, in the decisive battle, the Greeks in the Egyptian service fought with desperation, and the issue of the struggle was for a long time doubtful. In the two centuries which intervened between Cambyses and Alexander, the Greeks played an important part in the successive attempts of Egypt to throw off the Persian domination. Under the so called Mendesian and Sebenytic (XXIX. and XXX.) dynasties, Egypt succeeded, with Greek aid, in achieving independence, and was not again reconquered by the Persians until 342 B. C., not long before the destruction of the Achaemenid monarchy by Alexander the Great.

There is no doubt that Egypt prospered under the strong rule of its last native Pharaohs. Every one of them, from Amyrtæus, the first successful rebel against the Great King, and the predecessor of the Mendesian Dynasty, down to Nectanebo II., who was conquered by Artaxerxes (Ochus) and fled to Ethiopia, had done his best to efface all traces of the Persian invasions, and restore to the country the appearance which it had presented before the days of its servitude. Even those sovereigns of the fourth century whose reign was of the briefest constructed or beautified the monuments of the Nile Valley. The Thebaid was especially the field of their labors. The Island of Philæ, exposed to the ceaseless attacks of the Ethiopians, had been reduced to little more than a pile of ruins. Nectanebo II. erected there a magnificent gate, and one at least of the buildings that still remain, the rectangular kiosk, the pillars of which, with their Hathor capitals, rise above the southern extremity of the island and mark the spot at which the Ethiopian pilgrims first set foot on the sacred territory of Isis. Without giving a detailed list of what was accomplished by each of these latter Pharaohs, the author of this history asserts that there are few important sites in the valley of the Nile where some striking evidence of their activity may not be yet discovered even after the lapse of so many centuries. Moreover, in spite of the brief space of time within which they were wrought, the majority of these works betray no signs of haste or slipshod execution; the craftsmen employed on them seem to have preserved in their full integrity all the artistic traditions of earlier times, and were capable of producing masterpieces which will bear comparison with those of Egypt's golden age.

IV.

In a chapter on Greek travellers in Egypt, our author points out that, to those who, like Herodotus, visited the Nile Valley when it was under the Persian domination, Memphis was very much what Cairo is to us, viz.: the typical Oriental city, the quintessence and chief representative of ancient Egypt. In spite of the disasters which had overwhelmed it during the last few centuries, Memphis was still, in the fifth century B. C., a very beautiful city, ranking with Babylon as one of the largest in the world. Its religious festivals, especially those in honor of Apis, attracted numberless pilgrims to it at certain seasons of the year, and hosts of foreigners recruited from every race of Northern Africa, Western Asia and Southeastern Europe, resorted to it for purposes of trade. Most of the nationalities who frequented the city had a special quarter which was named after them; thus the Phœnicians occupied the Tyrian Camp; the Greeks and Carians the Hellenic Wall and Carian Wall. In the time of Herodotus, a Persian garrison was stationed within the so-called White Wall, ready to execute the Satrap's orders in the event of rebellion. Animals which one would scarcely expect to find in the streets of a capital, such as cows, sheep and goats wandered about unheeded in the most crowded thoroughfares; for the common people, instead of living apart from the beasts, as the Greeks did, stabled them in their own houses. Nor was this the only custom which must have seemed strange in the eyes of a newly-arrived visitor, for the Egyptians might almost have been said to make a point of doing everything differently from other nations. The baker seen at the kneading trough inside his shop worked the dough with his foot; on the other hand, the mason used no trowel in applying his mortar, and the poorer classes scraped up handfuls of mud mixed with dung when they had occasion to repair the walls of their hovels. In Greece, even the very poorest retired to their houses and ate with closed doors; the Egyptians felt no repugnance at eating and drinking in the open air, declaring that unbecoming and improper acts should be performed in secret, but seemly acts in public. The first blind alley they came to, a recess between two hovels, the doorstep of a house or temple, any of these localities seemed to them a perfectly natural place to dine in. Their bill of fare was not a sumptuous one. A sort of flat pancake, somewhat bitter in taste, and made not of wheat or barley, but of spelt (the grain known to us as German wheat) a little oil, an onion or a leek, with an occasional scrap of meat or poultry, washed down by a jug of beer or wine; there was nothing here to tempt the foreigner, and, besides, it would not have been thought right for him to invite himself to partake of the meal.

A Greek who lived on the flesh of the cow was looked upon as unclean in the highest degree; no Egyptian would have thought of using the same pot or knife with him, or of kissing him on the mouth by way of greeting. Moreover, Egyptian etiquette did not tolerate the same familiarities as the Greek: two friends, on catching sight of one another, paused before they met, bowed, then clasped one another round the knees, or pretended to do so. Young people gave way to an old man, or if seated rose to let him pass. The Greek traveller would recall the fact that the Spartans behaved in the same way, and he would approve this mark of deference; but nothing in his home life had prepared him for the sight of respectable women coming and going as they pleased, without escort and unveiled, carrying burdens on their shoulders (whereas the men carried them on their heads), going to market, keeping stalls or shops while their husbands or fathers stayed comfortably at home, wove cloth, kneaded the potter's clay, or turned the wheel and worked at their trades: no wonder that Greek travellers were ready to believe that in Egypt, the man was the slave and the wife the mistress of the family. Some historians traced the origin of these customs back to Osiris, others only as far as Sesostris. Sesostris (Rameses II.) was the last resource of Greek historians when they got into difficulties. The city of Memphis would be found crowded with monuments: there was the temple of the Phoenician Astarte (called by Herodotus a foreign Aphrodite) in which priests of Syrian descent had celebrated the mysteries of the great goddess ever since the days of the Eighteenth Dynasty; then there was the Temple of Ra, the Temple of Amon, the Temple of Tumu, the Temple of Bastie and the Temple of Isis.

The Temple of Phtah, in the fifth century B. C. as yet intact, provided the visitor with a spectacle scarcely less admirable than that offered by the Temple of the Theban Amon at Karnak. Successive kings had modified the original plan as each thought best, one adding obelisks, or colossal statues, another a pylon, a third a pillared hall. Completed in this way by the labors of a score of dynasties, the Temple of Phtah at Memphis formed, as it were, a microcosm of Egyptian history, in which each image, inscription and statue aroused the attention of the curious. Interpreters would be at hand, who bartered such information as they possessed, and the modern traveller who has had occasion to employ the services of a dragoman will have no difficulty is estimating the value of intelligence thus hawked about in ancient times. As for most of the personages glibly enumerated by Herodotus in connection with Memphis, it would be labor lost to search for their names among the inscriptions: some of these are mere puppets of popular romance, being nothing more than the epithets employed by story tellers to characterize in general terms the heroes of their tales. One can understand how Greek strangers, placed at the mercy of their dragoman, would be tempted to transform each title into a name.

The excursions made by the Greek traveller in the environs of Memphis 2,400 years ago would be very similar to those taken by modern visitors to Cairo: on the opposite bank of the Nile there was Heliopolis, with its Temple of Ra; then there were the quarries of Turah, which had been worked from time immemorial, yet never had been exhausted, and from which the monuments he had been admiring and the very Pyramids themselves, had been taken, stone by stone. It is possible that the Sphinx already lay hidden beneath the sand, and it appears that the nearest Pyramids, those at Saqquarah, were held in small esteem by visitors; they were told as they passed by that the step Pyramid was the most ancient of all, having been erected by Uenephes, one of the kings of the First Dynasty, and they asked no further questions. Their curiosity was reserved for the three giant structures at Gizeh, and for their inmates, Cheops, Chephren, Mykerinos and the fair Nitokras with the rosy cheeks. Through all the country round, at Heliopolis, and even in the Fayum itself, they heard the same names that had been dinned into their ears at Memphis; the whole of the monuments were made to fit into a single cycle of popular history. Maspero is unable to say whether many Greek travellers in the Persian period cared to stray much beyond Lake Moeris. It is certain that a stranger who ventured as far as the Thebaid would have found himself in the same plight as a European in the last century who undertook to reach the First Cataract. The point of departure, Memphis or Cairo, was very much the same, the destinations, Elephantine and Assuan, differed but little. The same means of transport was employed, for, excepting the cut of the sails, the modern dahabeah is an exact counterpart of the pleasure and passenger boats shown on the monuments. The Greek and the modern traveller would set out at the same time of year, namely, in November and December, after the floods had subsided. Ten or twelve days later, the Greek tourist would find himself at Panopolis; the journey thence to Elephantine, stopping at Coptos and Thebes, would take about a month, allowing time for a stay at the latter city. The return to Memphis would take place in February or March.

The Greek of the sixth and fifth centuries, B.C., would not be so keenly alive to the picturesqueness of the scenes through which he passed as is the modern visitor, consequently, in the account of his travels, he took no note of the long lines of laden boats going up or down stream, nor of the vast sheet of water glowing in the midday sun, nor of the mountains honeycombed with tombs and quarries at the foot of which he would be sailing day after day. What, above all things, interested him was information with regard to the sources of the immense river itself, and the reasons for its periodic overflow, and, according to the mental attitude impressed on him by his education, he would accept the mythological solution offered by the natives, or he would seek for a more natural one in the physical lore of his own savants. When Herodotus went up the Nile, Thebes had become the ghost of its former self; the Persian governors had neglected the city, and its princesses and their ministers were so impoverished that they were unable to keep up its temples and palaces. Herodotus scarcely mentions it; he had visited the still flourishing Memphis, where the temples were cared for and were filled with worshippers. Two or three things only appeared to him worthy of notice in Thebes. His admiration was aroused by the 360 statues of the high priests of Amon, which had already excited the wonder of his rival, Hecatæus; he noted that all these personages were represented as mere men, and he took the opportunity of ridiculing the vanity of his compatriots, who did not hesitate to inscribe the name of a god at the head of their own genealogies, although their most distant ancestors might be removed only by a score of generations from their own time. The temple servitors also related to him how two Theban priestesses, carried off by the Phœnicians and sold, one in Lybya and the other in Greece, had set up the first oracles known in those two countries. Herodotus is quite overcome with joy at the thought that Greek divination could be thus directly traced to that of Egypt, for, like most of his contemporaries, he felt that the Hellenic cult was ennobled by the fact of its being derived from the Egyptian.

The Nile traveller at that epoch had to turn homeward on reaching Elephantine, as that was the station of the last Persian garrison. Nubia, that is to say, Ethiopia—lay immediately beyond the cataracts, and the Ethiopians, at times, crossed the frontier and carried their raids as far as Thebes. Elephantine, like Assuan at the present day, was the centre of a flourishing trade. Here might be seen Kushites from Napata, or Meroe; negroes from the Upper Nile and the Bahr el-Ghazal, and Ammonians, from all of whom the curious visitor might glean information. The cataract was navigable all the year round, and the natives in its vicinity enjoyed the privilege of piloting freight boats through its difficult channel. Above it, the Nile spread out, and resembled a lake dotted over with islands, several of which contained celebrated temples, which were as much frequented by the Ethiopians as by the Egyptians.

It was not Egypt herself that the Greeks of the fifth century B. C. beheld, but merely her external artistic aspect and the outward setting of Egyptian civilization. The vastness of her monuments, the splendor of her tombs, the pomp of her ceremonies, the dignity and variety of her religious formulas attracted their curiosity and commanded their respect; in truth, the wisdom of the Egyptians had passed into a proverb with them, as it had with the Hebrews. But, if Herodotus and his Greek predecessors had penetrated behind the scenes, they would have been obliged to acknowledge that, beneath the attractive exterior lay hopeless decay. As with all organisms when they have passed their prime, Egypt was daily losing her elasticity and energy. Her spirit had sunk into a torpor, she had become unresponsive to her environment, and could no longer adapt herself to the proportions she had so easily acquired in her youth; it was as much as she could do to occupy fully the narrower limits to which she had been reduced and to maintain these unbroken. The instinct that made her shrink from the intrusion of foreign customs and ideas, or even from mere contact with nations of recent growth, was not solely the outcome of vanity. She realized that she could maintain her national integrity only by relying on the residue of her former institutional solidarity and on the force of custom. The slightest disturbance of the equilibrium established among her members would have robbed her of such vigor as she still retained and brought about her dissolution. She owed whatever vitality she kept to impulses imparted by the play of her ancient mechanism, a mechanism so stable in its action, and so ingeniously constructed that it still had a reserve of power sufficient to keep the whole in motion for centuries provided there was no attempt to introduce new wheels among the old. The tactics and armaments by which Egypt had won her victories up to her prime had, at length, become fetters, which she was no longer inclined to shake off, and, even if she were yet able to breed a military caste, she was no longer able to produce armies fit to win battles without the aid of mercenaries. In order to be successful in the field, she had to associate with her own troops recruits from other countries who served to turn the scale. The machinery of government, like the organization of the native military force, had become antiquated and degenerate. The nobility were as turbulent as in long distant times, and the royal authority was as powerless now as of old to assert itself in the absence of external help, or when treason was afoot among the troops. Religion alone maintained its ascendancy, and began to assume to itself the loyalty once given to the Pharaoh, and the devotion previously consecrated to the fatherland. If Egypt remained tolerably quiet for some six centuries under the domination, first, of Alexander and his successors, and then of the Romans, it was because the native religion was left practically undisturbed, until it was assailed and extinguished by Christianity.

M. W. H.

Jowett's Thucydides.

It would not be easy to exaggerate the value of the service rendered to English-speaking people by the late Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol College, and Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, through his translations of Plato and Thucydides. It is improbable that the tasks which he accomplished will be reessayed by any of his countrymen, but it does not follow that new editions of his versions may not be needed, as new Greek inscriptions are discovered and deciphered, and as new excavations are made within the sphere of the Hellenic world. The translation of Thucydides was first published in 1881, and, when we consider how much light has been since thrown upon Greek history in the fifth century B. C. by scholarly investigation and by the spade, the need of a new edition will be recognized. The revisors, Messrs. W. H. Forbes, and Evelyn Abbott, have compared the translation carefully with the original and corrected the author's preliminary essay on inscriptions by the help of recent additions to our knowledge. The text which they have followed is that of Becker, and they express their obligations as regards the translation to Marchant's edition of Books II., VI. and VII., and Goodhart's edition of Book VIII., and as regards inscriptions to Meisterhans' "Grammar of Attic Inscriptions," to the third supplement to the "Corpus of Attic Inscriptions," and to Roehl's "Most Ancient Greek Inscriptions." The changes made in Dr. Jowett's version, being, for the most part, of no great importance, we shall here confine ourselves to pointing out why Thucydides among the Greeks, like Tacitus among the Romans, is an author of perennial interest and usefulness to readers of our own day.

A geographer Thucydides was not; one of the preliminary notes to this translation deals with his geographical errors. Such topographical mistakes do not impeach the general credibility of his history; much less do they impair its philosophical value. No other ancient historian came so near as did Thucydides to satisfying the definition quoted by Lord Bolingbroke that "History is philosophy teaching by example." If the philosophy be sound and the examples be authentic, we should be able to draw from Thucydides lessons applicable to recent times. There are three questions, for instance, not academic, but actual, nay, urgent, upon which Thucydides should be able to cast some light. The questions to which we refer are concerned, first, with the relation of a mother country to her daughter State; secondly, with the transformation of a State from a power principally military, into one mainly, if not exclusively, naval; and, thirdly, with the difficulties encountered by a great naval power in prosecuting successfully a distant military expedition.

A Greek colony held toward its parent State a relation different from that which the Australian colonies occupy toward England on the one hand, and from that which the United States occupy toward England on the other. Were it not for the retention of religious, social and family ties, a Greek colony would find an analogue in the swarm of bees which, having left the parental hive, finds for itself a new abode. A Greek colony was not bound to the parent State by such ties of political allegiance as connect the Australian colonies with England. On the other hand, it was not so totally dissevered from the mother country as the United States have been since 1783. If we would form an idea of the indissolubility of the religious bond which united Corinth, for instance, to its daughter States, Corcyra and Syracuse, we should have to assume that the state of things now existed throughout the American Republic which obtained in Virginia before the Declaration of Independence, a state of things under which Anglicanism was the established religion, and all clergymen licensed to preach had to be ordained by the Bishop of London. It is obvious that the perpetuity of such a religious bond would imply and continually re-enforce social sympathies and intimate family relationships. One would say then *a priori* that the recognition of kinship between a Greek parent city and its daughter city ought to have been much more durable and ardent than the bond which unites the United States to England. As regards the relation of Corinth to Syracuse the assumption is founded upon fact, but that the closeness of sympathy observable in this case was rather fortuitous than inherent in the nature of things seems evident from another fact that the most virulent antipathy known among Greeks existed between Corinth and its daughter State, Corcyra. Indeed, when we peruse in Thucydides an account of the relations between Corinth and Corcyra, we seem to be reading by anticipation the history of England and the United States during the last hundred years.

In the first book of of his narrative, Thucydides points out that the earliest naval engagement between Greeks on record was that between Corinthians and the Corcyræans, which occurred about 664 B. C. A little later, in explaining the origins of the Peloponnesian War, he recalls the fact that the Corinthians hated the Corcyræans, who were their own colony, but slighted them. In their common festivals, the Corcyraeans would not allow the Corinthians the customary privileges of founders, and, at their sacrifices denied to the Corinthians the right of receiving first a lock of hair cut from the head of the victim, an honor usually granted by colonies to a representative of the mother country. In fact, the Corcyræans despised the Corinthians, for they were more than a match for them in military strength, and as rich as any state then existing in Hellas. Again, the grounds on which the Corcyræans requested to be admitted to alliance with the Athenians just before the Peloponnesian War are almost identical with those which were set forth by Benjamin Franklin at Paris in 1777, when he urged upon France an alliance with England's American colonies. "If they [the Corinthians] say that we are their colony and that, therefore, you have no right to receive us, they should be made to understand that all colonies honor their mother city when she treats them well, but are estranged from her by injustice. For colonists are not meant to be the servants, but the equals of those who remain at home." Analogous, on the other hand, to the position taken by Lord North's representatives at Paris is the answer made at Athens by the Corinthian envoys to the Corcyræan request: "Although Corcyra is our colony, its citizens have always stood aloof from us, and now they are fighting against us on the plea that they were not sent out to be ill used. To which we rejoin that we did not send them out to be insulted by them, but that we might be recognized as their leaders, and receive proper respect." The parallel between the relations of Corcyra to Corinth on the one hand, and those of the United States to England on the other, might be carried much further. It is well known that throughout the Peloponnesian War, which lasted nearly thirty years, the Corcyræans, except for a brief reactionist interval, were stanch, zealous and efficient allies of the Athenians, and that it was no fault of theirs that their mother city Corinth, as well as her ally, Sparta, were not levelled with the ground. There is no doubt that the Thirteen American Colonies would have been equally faithful allies of France had our Revolutionary War overlapped the war between England and the French Republic and Empire.

We pass to the transformation of Athens from a military into a naval power, which was begun by Themistocles just before the Battle of Salamis (480 B. C.), and completed by Pericles, who launched the Athenian Empire into the war with the Peloponnesians. That is the transformation which England has undergone during the present century. "In those days," says Thucydides, "it was the great glory of the Lacedæmonians to be a land power distinguished for their military prowess, and for the Athenians to be a nation of sailors and the first sea power in Hellas." In the mouth of Pericles addressing the Athenians, who had incurred severe defeats on land, are put the following words: "I will indicate one element of your superiority which appears to have escaped you, although it nearly touches your imperial greatness. I, on my part, have never mentioned it before, nor would I now, because the claim may seem too arrogant, if I did not see that you are unreasonably depressed. You think that your empire is confined to your allies, but I say that, of the two divisions of the world accessible to man, the land and the sea, there is one of which you are absolute master, and have, or may have, the dominion to any extent to which you please. Neither the Great King nor any nation on earth can hinder a navy like yours from penetrating whithersoever you choose to sail." Of the great naval commander Phormio, we are told that "he had always been in the habit of telling the Athenian sailors, and training their minds to believe, that no superiority of hostile forces could justify them in retreating. And it had long been a received opinion among the sailors, that, as Athenians, they were bound to face any quantity of Peloponnesian ships."

The conclusive test of the Athenian power, which was principally naval, was applied by the Sicilian expedition. In the fifth century B. C., Syracuse was no nearer to Athens, neither was it much further from that city, than Cape Town is from England to-day. At the time when the expedition set forth, Athens was as preponderant in the Eastern Mediterranean as England now is in the Atlantic and the Indian oceans. But the Athenian military force, which had gradually been depleted for the benefit of the navy, proved too weak to maintain a protracted contest upon land, and the outcome of the effort to subjugate the Syracusan commonwealth ended in deplorable catastrophe. The Dorian inhabitants of Syracuse were regarded by Athenians very much as the Boers of the Transvaal are looked upon by Englishmen. From the viewpoint of literature and art, they were undeniably backward by many generations as compared with the countrymen of Phidias and Sophocles. The Syracusans, indeed, could appreciate such plays as those of Euripides, but they were unable to write them. The contempt, however, which the Athenians felt for the artistic and literary standards of the Syracusans did not extend to their political institutions, or, in the end, to their prowess in war. The constitution of Syracuse at the time of the Athenian invasion was as democratic as that of its assailants.

To this fact Thucydides attributes the dreadful reverses encountered by his countrymen, and it is upon this account that he feels constrained to withhold from the latter his sympathy. After narrating how, even after the expedition had been re-enforced, the Syracusans gained a brilliant victory, Thucydides goes on to record that: "The Athenians were in utter despair. Great was their surprise at the result, and still greater their regret that they had ever come. The Sicilian were the only cities which they had ever encountered similar in character to their own, having the same democratic institutions. They were not able, by holding out the prospect of a change of government, to introduce an element of discord among them which might have gained them over, nor could they master them by a decided superiority of force." Thucydides goes on to say that "the Syracusans, having repeatedly beaten their assailants, were now striving no longer to achieve their own deliverance, but to cut off the escape of the Athenians; they considered their position already far superior, as, indeed, it was, and they hoped that, if they could conquer the Athenians, their success would be glorious in the eyes of all the Hellenes, who would be at once set free, some from slavery, others from fear. For the Athenians, having lost so much of their power, would never be able to face the enemies who would rise up against them. And the glory of the deliverance would be ascribed to the Syracusans, who would be honored by all living men and all future ages."

In the funeral oration ascribed to Pericles, there is a memorable passage, the whole of which was applicable to England six months ago, but only a part of which may be applied to her with truth to-day: "In the hour of trial, Athens alone among her contemporaries is superior to the report of her. No enemy who comes against her is indignant at the reverses which he sustains at the hands of such a city; no subject complains that his masters are unworthy of him. And we shall assuredly not be without witnesses; there are mighty monuments of our power which will make us the wonder of this and succeeding ages; we shall not need the praises of Homer or of any other panegyrist. For we have compelled every land and every sea to open a path for our valor, and have everywhere planted eternal memorials of our friendship and of our enmity."